

*Supply—Privy Council*

In any event, this shows that in the United States there is some recognition by the executive of the argument that is made; that is, we are all going to have to face the same danger and no one should be given a privileged position because of his or her financial capacity to provide a shelter, something that might be denied others not so fortunate to possess resources which would enable the building of a shelter in a residence or place of business. Certainly, in principle it is difficult to resist the suggestion that if we think a shelter policy is desirable there should be a policy of non-discrimination so that every Canadian, particularly the younger people and the older people, should be afforded an equal opportunity, regardless of their economic resources, to receive the protection which would come from a shelter program sponsored and financed by the government of the nation.

The Prime Minister has observed that an adequate program of public shelters would cost between \$4 billion and \$5 billion. I think the hon. member for Trinity, who has given this matter a good deal of thought, suggested a much lower figure when he spoke on this subject last year. In any case, this is a large sum of money, and the government must take into account, in the light of its other obligations, whether or not such a program should be undertaken. My own view now is that if the government feels that the scientists have satisfied it that protection can be provided by shelters, we must now at least begin to embark on a program of public shelters based on the principle of non-discrimination. The extent to which this program will be developed must be decided by the government, because it has information not available to the rest of us, besides having responsibilities which do not belong to all of us.

The government, then, will make that decision. But the government is entitled to receive from us an indication of what we feel is the course it should take. I think the reaction of Premier Roblin will impress the Prime Minister with the frustration which many people have—a frustration which is not entirely due to the way in which this problem is being handled by the government, but is due in a large measure to the inherent character of the problem itself. However, the government cannot escape its share of responsibility for not giving clearer guidance in certain particulars, and I suggest to the Prime Minister that it is not fair to the premier of Manitoba, and it is not fair to the development of civil defence policy for the Prime Minister of the country, who has such heavy responsibilities, to be himself the co-ordinator of the entire program of civil defence. It is just not possible, in my view, for one holding the office of prime

minister to be in charge of civil defence over three other ministers, who have a shared responsibility in civil defence policy.

I said a moment ago it was up to the government to determine if we should embark on a program of shelters under public or private auspices. I say I now believe strongly that we should have public shelters. I am not saying to what extent. I would have to give further thought to that in the light of views expressed by those who are authorities on this matter; but some of those who are within sound of my voice know that we have had some discussions on this question recently. But we are entitled to be told by the government if a program of shelters will do the job or not. For instance, Dr. Waldemar Sackston, professor of entomology at Macdonald College, who participated in a public discussion on this subject with the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Defence has stated he is concerned about the program in Canada stemming from one in the United States. The report quotes Dr. Sackston as follows:

He said serious under-estimation of the casualties that might come from a nuclear attack was deluding the public into a belief in the possibility of survival.

And, later:

People in shelters stand no chance of being rescued because there would be no one to rescue them.

What is the considered opinion of the government in this regard? That was not its opinion a year ago. I suspect it is not its opinion today. But we are entitled to have a clear direction as to the value of shelters and the protection they afford.

Then we should have from the government, I think, as they recently had in England, a clear and unequivocal statement as to evacuation. Evacuation was the policy in Canada until four or five years ago. It was originally the policy of the United Kingdom, though it was for a while abandoned there. I understand the United Kingdom has recently gone back to the position that evacuation as a policy is not to be considered as having been abandoned. Some people believe that evacuation represents the effective form of civil defence. Is that the policy of the government of Canada? It is important that we should have direction along these lines. Only in today's paper we saw a report in the *Globe and Mail* on the first page, from Mr. Topping under a Moscow dateline, indicating that western observers have found what they believe to be evidence of an extensive system of bomb shelters in a number of cities in the Soviet union. The article goes on to indicate that some of these shelters obviously represent a policy which was developed in the